

REMARKS

The Examiner's comments from the Office Action mailed December 13, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 1-42 remain pending in the application. Amendments have been made to claims 1, 7, 23, 30, and 35. Support for these revisions can be found throughout the specification and figures. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 34, 35, 37, and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Lui et al. ("Interoperability of Peer-to-Peer File Sharing Protocols," August 2002) (hereinafter, "Lui") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,206,304 to Low et al. (hereinafter "Low"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request for access to document stored on a first computer system; and replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location.

The combination of Lui and Low does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request for access to document stored on a first computer system; and replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location.

The Office Action admits Lui does not disclose or suggest replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location. Low does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui. Low discloses resolving a name or number string with an IP address using a Domain Name System (DNS) of the Internet. See Low, column 5, lines 35-42; column 10, lines 62-65; and column 13, line 60 through column 14, line 36; and FIG. 6. The resolution in Low is not implemented by the same computer that implements a user interface that receives the request for access to documents. See *id.* In contrast, claim 1 requires replacing the user-friendly handle at the second computer system, on which the user interface is implemented.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 1, even in view of Low. Claims 3, 5, and 6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 7 recites, in part, resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle with a machine location in a request for access to documents, wherein the request is made to the publishing node from a user of the accessing node via a user interface stored on the accessing node.

The combination of Lui and Low does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle with a machine location in a request for access to documents, wherein the request is made to the publishing node from a user of the accessing node via a user interface stored on the accessing node.

The Office Action admits Lui does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle with a machine location. Low does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui. In Low, resolution does not occur at the same computer system storing the user interface through which the request is made for a user of the accessing node. Rather, as noted above with respect to claim 1, Low discloses resolving a name or number string with an IP address using a Domain Name System (DNS) of the Internet.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 7, even in view of Low. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 7, 9, and 10 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 23 recites, in part, receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request from a second user of the second computer system to access a first document

stored on a first computer system; and amending at the second computer system the request to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location of the first computer system.

The combination of Lui and Low does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request from a second user of the second computer system to access a first document stored on a first computer system; and amending at the second computer system the request to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location of the first computer system.

The Office Action admits Lui does not disclose or suggest amending at the second computer system the request to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location of the first computer system. Low does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui. In Low, name resolution does not occur at the same computer system implementing the user interface at which the request is received from a user of the accessing node. Rather, as noted above with respect to claim 1, Low discloses resolving a name or number string with an IP address using a Domain Name System (DNS) of the Internet.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 23, even in view of Low. Claims 25, 28, and 29 depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 23, 25, 28, and 29 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 30 recites, in part, a user interface module configured to enable a user of a first computer system to access and control a name resolution module, which intercepts requests for access to documents stored on a second computer system and amends each request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

The combination of Lui and Low does not disclose or suggest a user interface module configured to enable a user of a first computer system to access and control a name resolution module, which intercepts requests for access to documents stored on a second computer system and amends each request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

The Office Action admits Lui does not disclose or suggest a name resolution module as recited in claim 30. Low does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui. In Low, the user requesting access to the documents does not have control over the computer implementing the name resolution. Rather, name resolution in Low is implemented by a third party (e.g., using a Domain Name System (DNS) of the Internet).

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 30, even in view of Low. Claims 32 and 34 depend from claim 30 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 30, 32, and 34 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 35 recites, in part, receiving at a user interface implemented on the accessing computer system instructions from a user of the accessing computer system to generate a request for access to documents; and amending at the accessing computer system the request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

The combination of Lui and Low does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on the accessing computer system instructions from a user of the accessing computer system to generate a request for access to documents; and amending at the accessing computer system the request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

The Office Action admits Lui does not disclose or suggest amending at the accessing computer system the request to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location. Low does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 23.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 35, even in view of Low. Claims 37 and 42 depend from claim 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 35, 35, and 42 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claims 4, 11-15, 17-22, 26, 27, 33, 34, 38-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,782,847 to Boyle et al. (hereinafter "Boyle"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Boyle does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Boyle also does not disclose or suggest replacing at a second computer system a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request from a user of the second computer system. In fact, Boyle does not even disclose or suggest replacing a user-friendly handle with a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 4, even in view of Low and Boyle. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 4 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claims 11-15 and 17-22 depend from claim 7 and are allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 7. Boyle does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Boyle also does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle with a machine location in a request for access to documents, wherein the request is made to the publishing node from a user of the accessing node via a user interface stored on the accessing node.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 11-15 and 17-22, even in view of Low and Boyle. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 11-15 and 17-22 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 23 and are allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 23. Boyle does

not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Boyle also does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request from a second user of the second computer system to access a first document stored on a first computer system; and amending at the second computer system the request to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location of the first computer system.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 26 and 27, even in view of Low and Boyle. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 26 and 27 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 30 and are allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 30. Boyle does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Boyle also does not disclose or suggest a user interface module configured to enable a user of a first computer system to access and control a name resolution module, which intercepts requests for access to documents stored on a second computer system and amends each request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 33 and 34, even in view of Low and Boyle. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 33 and 34 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claims 38-41 depend from claim 35 and are allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 35. Boyle does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Boyle also does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on the accessing computer system instructions from a user of the accessing computer system to generate a request for access to documents; and amending at the accessing computer system the request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 38-41, even in view of Low and Boyle. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 38-41 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 31, and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,065,587 to Huitema et al. (hereinafter "Huitema"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest replacing at a second computer system a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request from a user of the second computer system.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 2, even in view of Low and Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 2 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claims 8 and 16 depend from claim 7 and are allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 7. Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle with a machine location in a request for access to documents, wherein the request is made to the publishing node from a user of the accessing node via a user interface stored on the accessing node.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 8 and 16, even in view of Low and Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 8 and 16 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 23. Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request from a second user of the second computer system to access a first document stored on a first computer system; and amending at the second computer system the request to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location of the first computer system.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 24, even in view of Low and Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 24 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and is allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 30. Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest a user interface module configured to enable a user of a first computer system to access and control a name resolution module, which intercepts requests for access to documents stored on a second computer system and amends each request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 31, even in view of Low and Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 31 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 36 depends from claim 35 and is allowable over the combination of Lui and Low for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 35. Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest receiving at a user interface implemented on the accessing computer system instructions from a user of the accessing computer system to generate a request for access to documents; and amending at the

accessing computer system the request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 36, even in view of Low and Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 36 are respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.



Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: March 13, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No. 50,471
RAK/JKS:rlk